

Pupil premium strategy / self- evaluation – Cathedral Academy

| 1. Summary information | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|
| School | Cathedral Academy | | | | |
| Academic Year | 17/18 | Total PP budget | £283,305 | Date of most recent PP Review | Oct 2018 |
| Total number of pupils | 735 | Number of pupils eligible for PP | 360 | Date for next internal review of this strategy | March 2019 |
| 2. Current attainment | | | | | |
| | | | Pupils eligible for PP (your school) | Pupils not eligible for PP (national average) | |
| % Achieving Basics E/M 4+ | | | 59% | 71% | |
| Progress 8 score average | | | +0.42 | +0.13 | |
| Attainment 8 score average | | | 42 | 50 | |
| | | | | | |
| 3. Barriers to future attainment (for pupils eligible for PP) | | | | | |
| Academic barriers (<i>issues to be addressed in school, such as poor literacy skills</i>) | | | | | |
| A. | % of PP students that arrive below average literacy | | | | |
| B. | % of PP students that arrive below average in numeracy | | | | |
| Additional barriers (<i>including issues which also require action outside school, such as low attendance rates</i>) | | | | | |
| C | Attendance of PP students/PA PP students | | | | |
| D | FTE PP students | | | | |
| E | % of students from NCOP postcodes, IDACI Index | | | | |
| 4. Intended outcomes (<i>specific outcomes and how they will be measured</i>) | | | | Success criteria | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| A. | Teaching and Learning for all students in all year groups including for PP students will be at least good | 90% of teaching through lesson observations meet the expectation of Good or better. |
| B. | GCSE Outcomes for PP students will be strong and will match those of non-PP nationally, closing the gap on the non-PP students at Cathedral Academy | P8 in line or better than national non-PP |
| C. | Literacy and numeracy barriers for PP students will be removed with improved performance and progress | End of year 9 GL assessments show that 80% of those arriving with low levels of RWM have significantly closed the gap on their peers. |
| D. | Behaviour and attendance will improve for PP students to close the gap on their non-PP peers at CA | PA for PP students reduces by 25% Attendance for PP students rises to be in line with national average. |

5. Planned expenditure

Academic year

The three headings enable you to demonstrate how you are using the Pupil Premium to improve classroom pedagogy, provide targeted support and support whole school strategies.

i. Quality of teaching for all

| Action | Intended outcome | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? | How will you ensure it is implemented well? | Staff lead | When will you review implementation? |
|--|--|---|--|------------|---|
| Staff CPD focused upon PP student barriers to success and T&L Elements to overcome barriers. | Quality of T&L across the academy improves further ensuring that all lessons are at least good, catering for the learning needs of all individuals. | Impact the CPD has had to date has been demonstrable with improved results over the past 2 years. Working across the MAT with colleagues in outstanding school. | QA and Learning Walks. Staff reflective CPD journals. Responsive to staff feedback on CPD. Impact monitored by SIP annually. | KCY | Termly using feedback from QA and Learning Walks |
| Participation of 2 members of staff in the MAT T&L development team with a focus on developing the best pedagogy across all MAT academies. | The very best practice is shared across all academies and implemented in a timely manner at CA. We are at the cutting edge of key developments and pedagogical research. | The highest performing MAT in the area, with all secondaries performing well above national average for all pupils and positively for PP students. Therefore strong evidence that we should work collaboratively. | Led by Vice Principal. Minuted meetings monitored by Principal and discussed at MAT strategic meetings. | KCY | Annually, when reviewing Academy Improvement Plan |

Total budgeted cost 32,000

| ii. Targeted support | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-------------------|--|
| Action | Intended outcome | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? | How will you ensure it is implemented well? | Staff lead | When will you review implementation? |
| Bungee, Platinum, Lexia interventions are put in place to support those with low levels of literacy and numeracy. | Students in receipt of PP make progress to close the attainment gap and ensure that literacy and numeracy are no longer barriers to success. | Intervention programmes proven to have impact across 3 schools within the MAT have been refined and adjusted for our cohort. | Led by the SENCO with support from the AP Curriculum and the Literacy Co-ordinator. Student progress will be tracked in-year with relevant adjustments/student groupings made to maximise impact throughout the year. | OHN | Termly review of progress of students. Annual review of programme. |
| Mintclass seating plans used to identify clearly all PP students and bespoke learning plans built around them | PP students are clearly identified by all staff in the planning process for all lessons. PP students are therefore prominent in the learning pan of all lessons. | Staff see numerous students every week and need to be able to quickly and easily identify PP students so that they can provide targeted support in lessons. | Curriculum deputy has oversight of MINTCLASS logins and ensures all staff are accessing the software regularly. Staff CPD time is allocated to the use of MINTCLASS. Blue folders are required to be available at all times and are checked during learning walks. | KCY | Annual review. |
| Employment of 6 Learning Mentors (3 Maths, 2 Eng, 1 Sci) who provide additional support and tuition to PP students. | PP students get additional one-to-one or small group tuition during the extended school day. Those at risk of exclusion also work with the Learning Mentors regular to fill knowledge gaps and make progress. | 2 years of successful results with PP students where these roles have featured significantly. Student feedback on the influence of the LMs on their progress. | Line managed by the Achievement Leader for year 11 and regular COBRA meetings to identify the focus of the LM role. Regular dialogue with teaching to staff to ensure the work complements what is going on in the classroom and ensures learning plans are individualised. | ABE | Annually following results. |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £168,000 |
| iii. Other approaches | | | | | |

| Action | Intended outcome | What is the evidence and rationale for this choice? | How will you ensure it is implemented well? | Staff lead | When will you review implementation? |
|---|--|---|--|-------------------|---|
| <p>Student Liaison Officer's and EWO assigned PP students in their year groups to monitor closely and ensure that they are on track with Achievement Points, that Behaviour Points are reduced and attendance is not a concern.</p> | <p>Less behaviour issues and reduced Fixed Term Exclusions for students in receipt of Pupil Premium.</p> | <p>Close monitoring and tracking has been utilised and when including regular dialogue with students we have seen improvements in attendance and engagement for PP students. Having routine and stability has shown impact.</p> | <p>AP Student Support monitors impact and reports termly to SLT. Staff are given weekly trackers for their own form showing at risk and key students. This is visited regularly in briefing.</p> | <p>NPT</p> | <p>Annual Review.</p> |
| <p>Literacy Coordinator role appointed with a focus on PP students with low Reading and Writing levels.</p> | <p>The 'word' gap is closed with students who have limited vocab, reading and writing skills identified and supported in improving and closing the gap between them and their peers.</p> | <p>The levels of our students on entry to the academy in RWM. The number of students who are below their chronological reading age. Therefore having a co-ordinator who implements the whole school literacy strategy is paramount.</p> | <p>Line managed by SLT, part of the Improvement Plan which is reviewed every term.</p> | <p>HDU</p> | <p>Termly, report to SLT.</p> |
| Total budgeted cost | | | | | £83,000 |

